Treasury Board of Canada Secretariat
Secrétariat du Conseil du Trésor du Canada

Common Look and Feel Self-Assessment Guide

BT22-79/2001E-IN
0-662-30499-3

Canada

102-01764/

Introduction 5
About the Guide 5
Audience 5
CLF requirements 5
How this guide is organized 5
Guide formats 5
Contact Information 6
1.0 Accessibility 7
Standard 1.1 – W3C checkpoints 7
W3C Checkpoint 1.1 – text equivalents 9
W3C Checkpoint 1.2 – server-side image maps 10
W3C Checkpoint 1.3 – auditory descriptions 11
W3C Checkpoint 1.4 – synchronize equivalents 12
W3C Checkpoint 2.1 – colour 13
W3C Checkpoint 2.2 – colour contrast 14
W3C Checkpoint 3.1 – bitmap images 15
W3C Checkpoint 3.2 – valid documents 16
W3C Checkpoint 3.3 – style sheets 17
W3C Checkpoint 3.4 – units 18
W3C Checkpoint 3.5 – headings 19
W3C Checkpoint 3.6 – lists 20
W3C Checkpoint 3.7 – quotations 21
W3C Checkpoint 4.1 – natural languages 22

W3C Checkpoint 5.1 – table headers 23
W3C Checkpoint 5.2 – table structure 24
W3C Checkpoint 5.3 – avoid tables for layout 25
W3C Checkpoint 5.4 – avoid tables for format 26
W3C Checkpoint 6.1 – order style sheets 27
W3C Checkpoint 6.2 – update dynamic content 28
W3C Checkpoint 6.3 – programmatic objects 29
W3C Checkpoint 6.4 – event handlers 30
W3C Checkpoint 6.5 – accessible dynamic content 31
W3C Checkpoint 7.1 – flickering 32
W3C Checkpoint 7.2 – blinking 33
W3C Checkpoint 7.3 – moving content 34
W3C Checkpoint 7.4 – auto-refreshing pagesk 35
W3C Checkpoint 7.5 – redirected pages 36
W3C Checkpoint 8.1 – embedded objects 37
W3C Checkpoint 9.1 – client-side image maps 38
W3C Checkpoint 9.2 – element interfaces 39
W3C Checkpoint 9.3 – logical event handlers 40
W3C Checkpoint 10.1 – pop-up and new windows 41
W3C Checkpoint 10.2 – form controls 42
W3C Checkpoint 11.1 – W3C technologies 43
W3C Checkpoint 11.2 – deprecated elements 44
W3C Checkpoint 11.4 – accessible equivalents 45
W3C Checkpoint 12.1 – frame titles 46
W3C Checkpoint 12.2 – frame relationships 47
W3C Checkpoint 12.3 – information blocks 48

W3C Checkpoint 12.4 – control labels 49
W3C Checkpoint 13.1 – link targets 50
W3C Checkpoint 13.2 – metadata 51
W3C Checkpoint 13.3 – site maps 52
W3C Checkpoint 13.4 – navigation 53
W3C Checkpoint 14.1 – writing styles 54
Standard 1.2 – document technologies 55
Standard 1.3 – alternate formats 58
Standard 1.4 – text equivalents 59
2.0 Collaborative Arrangements 60
Standard 2.1 – Federal Identity Program identities 60
Standard 2.2 – symbols 62
3.0 Cybersquatting 63
Standard 3.1 – domain names 63
4.0 E-mail 63
Standard 4.1 – institutional addresses 64
Standard 4.2 – signature blocks 65
Standard 4.3 – "Canada" wordmark and signatures for e-mail 66
Standard 4.4 – acknowledgements 67
5.0 Important Notices 68
Standard 5.1 – important notices link 68
Standard 5.2 – copyright notice 69
Standard 5.3 – privacy notice 70
Standard 5.4 – personal information 71
6.0 Navigation and Format 72
Standard 6.1 – common menu bar 72
Standard 6.2 – Institutional Menu Bar 73

Standard 6.3 – metatags 74
Standard 6.4 – date indicator 75
Standard 6.5 – colours 76
Standard 6.6 – frames 77
Standard 6.7 – Web analyzer tools 78
Standard 6.8 – validators 79
7.0 Official Languages 80
Standard 7.1 – domain names 80
Standard 7.2 – welcome pages 81
Standard 7.3 – "Canada" wordmark and signatures 83
Standard 7.4 – unilingual welcome page message 84
Standard 7.5 – language choice 85
Standard 7.6 – server messages languages 86
Standard 7.7 – text equivalent languages 87
Standard 7.8 – metatag languages 88
Standards 7.9 – collaborative arrangements languages 89
Standard 7.10 – e-mail addresses 90

Common Look and Feel Self-Assessment Guide

Introduction

About the Guide

The CLF Self-Assessment Guide has been developed by the Treasury Board Secretariat for departments and agencies to determine the compliance level of their Internet Web sites with the Common Look and Feel Standards. The Guide is available in HTML, PDF and an editable version for consultation and documentation.

Audience

Treasury Board Secretariat has produced the Guide for anyone needing to assess a federal Internet Web sites' compliance with Common Look and Feel Standards. This includes webmasters, auditors, Web designers and developers, among others.

CLF requirements

Government of Canada policy requires all institutions represented in Schedule 1, 1.1 and 2 of the Financial Administration Act to comply with Common Look and Feel Standards by December 31, 2002. These institutions will be required to submit a Report on their compliance by June 2003. See: CLF Background.

How this guide is organized

This Guide presents each Standard as a question and provides a brief explanation of the Standard. Standard 1.1 on Web site accessibility includes all Priority 1 and Priority 2 accessibility checkpoints developed by the World Wide Web Consortium (W3C). The normative reference for the checkpoints and for their interpretations is the W3C's Web Content Accessibility Guidelines 1.0. The explanations provided in this Guide for each W3C checkpoint are derived from W3C documents but they have not been approved by the W3C.

Guide formats

The Guide is available in four formats, as described below.

Format	Purpose	Link
HTML	Use this on-line version of the Guide to quickly review the Standards and explanations.	Questions and explanations
HTML Print	Print these compact versions of the Guide.	Questions only Questions & explanations

PDF (portable document format)	Print this formatted version of the Guide for convenient reference.	Questions only Questions & explanations
Editable (MS Word)	Use this version of the Guide to document the results of your Common Look and Feel assessment.	Questions only Questions & explanations

Contact Information

If you have any questions about the Guide, please contact the Information Policy Division, Treasury Board Secretariat at clf-upe@tbs.sct-gc.ca or by telephone at (613) 957-2538.

Standard 1.1 – W3C checkpoints

The interpretations provided under Standard 1.1 constitute non-normative annotations to the checkpoint explanations provided in the W3C's Web Content Accessibility Guidelines 1.0 (http://www.w3.org/TR/2001/WD-UAAG10-20010409/) and are in compliance with the W3C Copyright Notice (http://www.w3.org/Consortium/Legal/copyright-documents-19990405). W3C is not responsible for any content not found at the original URL.

Question:

Does the Web site comply with all W3C Priority 1 and Priority 2 checkpoints as listed below? [ ] Yes [ ] No

Reference: Standard 1.1

Explanation:

Standard 1.1 requires that Web sites comply with priorities 1 and 2 accessibility checkpoints developed by the World Wide Web Consortium (W3C) as outlined in the W3C document Web Content Accessibility Guidelines 1.0. The W3C's Web Accessibility Initiative (WAI) promotes accessibility of the Web for people with disabilities. Many of the accessibility solutions also improve usability for people other users as well. The Government of Canada shares this commitment and has developed its Common Look and Feel policy to ensure that all Canadians, regardless of ability, geographic location or demographic category, are given equal access to information on Government of Canada Web sites.

The W3C checkpoints also ensure easy technical access to the Web by the widest possible audience, including those using old browsers, screen readers, non-standard operating systems, slow connections, small screens, text-only screens, monochrome screens and emerging technologies such as wireless and hand-held devices.

Links:

Standard 1.1: www.w3.org/TR/WCAG10-TECHS/#tech-text-equivalent

W3C: www.w3.org/consortium/

Web Content Accessibility Guidelines 1.0: www.w3.org/TR/WCAG10/

Assessment record:

List of URIs assessed	Standard met (Y or N)	Notes

W3C Checkpoint 1.1 – text equivalents

Question:

Are text equivalents provided for every non-text element? [ ] Yes [ ] No

Reference: W3C 1.1

See also: Standard 1.4

Explanation:

Text equivalents are necessary for all users who cannot or choose not to browse graphic, video or audio information. Text equivalents are also used by search engines.

Text equivalents can be included through content elements or the use of 'alt', 'longdesc' or other markups. They describe the purpose and function of all non-text content, including images, text graphics, symbols, image maps (see W3C 1.2), animations, applets, objects, ASCII art, frames, scripts, graphical bullets, spacers, graphical buttons, sounds, stand-alone audio files, video audio files and video clips.

Links:

W3C 1.1: www.w3.org/TR/WCAG10-TECHS/ - tech-text-equivalent

Standard 1.4: www.cic-dpi.gc.ca/clf-upe/1/1_e.asp#1.4

Assessment record:

List of URIs assessed	Checkpoint met (Y or N)	Notes

W3C Checkpoint 1.2 – server-side image maps

Question:

Are redundant text links provided for each active region of a server-side image map?

[ ] Yes [ ] No

Reference: W3C 1.2

Explanation:

Some user-agents, such as text-only browsers, do not recognize server-side image maps. The links hidden in the server-side image map must also appear as a set of text links on the same page.

Links:

W3C 1.2: www.w3.org/TR/WCAG10-TECHS/#tech-redundant-server-links

Assessment record:

List of URIs assessed	Checkpoint met (Y or N)	Notes

W3C Checkpoint 1.3 – auditory descriptions

Question:

Are auditory descriptions provided for visual tracks of multimedia presentations?

[ ] Yes [ ] No

Reference: W3C 1.3

Explanation:

Auditory descriptions provide information about the actions, body language, graphics, and scene changes through pre-recorded human voices or synthesized voices. The auditory descriptions are usually fit within natural pauses in the audio track and must be synchronized with the visual track.

Links:

W3C 1.3: www.w3.org/TR/WCAG10-TECHS/#tech-auditory-descriptions

Assessment record:

List of URIs assessed	Checkpoint met (Y or N)	Notes

W3C Checkpoint 1.4 – synchronize equivalents

Question:

Are text equivalents of time-based multimedia presentations synchronized with the presentation? [ ] Yes [ ] No

Reference:

W3C 1.4

Explanation:

Text equivalents for the audio tracks of multimedia presentations are used by screen readers, search engines and people accessing the Web site without the aid of a sound system. The text equivalents can be: text transcripts of dialogs and sounds; a set of captions describing actions; or a collated text combining a dialog transcript and captions. Transcripts, captions and collations must be synchronized with the action.

Links:

W3C 1.4: www.w3.org/TR/WCAG10-TECHS/#tech-synchronize-equivalents

Assessment record:

List of URIs assessed	Checkpoint met (Y or N)	Notes

W3C Checkpoint 2.1 – colour

Question:

Is all information conveyed with colour understood without colour? [ ] Yes [ ] No

Reference: W3C 2.1

See also: Standard 6.5

Explanation:

People with colour deficits and those using monochrome displays must be able to access all information on the Web site. This includes text, images and navigation directions.

Links:

W3C 2.1: www.w3.org/TR/WCAG10-TECHS/#tech-color-convey

Standard 6.5: www.cio-dpi.gc.ca/clf-upe/6/6_e.asp#6.5

Assessment record:

List of URIs assessed	Checkpoint met (Y or N)	Notes

W3C Checkpoint 2.2 – colour contrast

Question:

Do foreground and background colour combinations provide sufficient contrast?

[ ] Yes [ ] No

Reference: W3C 2.2

See also: Standard 6.5

Explanation:

All text and images that convey information must be visible when viewed by someone having colour deficits or when viewed on a monochrome display. See also Standard 6.5.

Links:

W3C 2.2: www.w3.org/TR/WCAG10-TECHS/#tech-color-contrast

Standard 6.5: www.cio-dpi.gc.ca/clf-upe/6/6_e.asp#6.5

Assessment record:

List of URIs assessed	Checkpoint met (Y or N)	Notes

W3C Checkpoint 3.1 – bitmap images

Question:

If an appropriate markup language exists, has it been used instead of bitmapped graphics to convey information? [ ] Yes [ ] No

Reference: W3C 3.1

Explanation:

Bitmapped graphics used in place of text present accessibility problems because the text will be distorted when magnified. Text in images may be used if: the text is serving a graphical function, as in the case of a logo; the text effect cannot be achieved with a cascading style sheet; and if a text equivalent is provided for the image.

Links:

W3C 3.1: www.w3.org/TR/WCAG10-TECHS/#tech-use-markup

Assessment record:

List of URIs assessed	Checkpoint met (Y or N)	Notes

W3C Checkpoint 3.2 – valid documents

Question:

Do documents validate to published formal grammars? [ ] Yes [ ] No

Reference: W3C 3.2

See also: Standard 1.2

Explanation:

Design documents for compatibility and accessibility. Choose W3C-approved technologies, use languages to specification and apply standard software conventions to control the behavior and activation of user interface components. By using markup according to specification, content developers promote consistency, compatibility and accessibility, and maximize the effectiveness of indexing tools, search engines and navigation tools.

Links:

W3C 3.2: www.w3.org/TR/WCAG10-TECHS/#tech-identify-grammar

Standard 1.2: www.cio-dpi.gc.ca/clf-upe/1/1_e.asp#1.2

Assessment record:

List of URIs assessed	Checkpoint met (Y or N)	Notes

W3C Checkpoint 3.3 – style sheets

Question:

Are cascading style sheets (CSSs) used properly? [ ] Yes [ ] No

Reference: W3C 3.3

Explanation:

CSSs separate style from markup and allow precise control over fonts, spacing, numbering, alignment and positioning of text and other content elements. This prevents the misuse of HTML tags, reduces the size of files, enhances the usability of reading browsers and allows users to override author styles through a user style sheet. CSSs also support aural style sheets that specify properties such as volume and background sounds. Because some browsers either do not support or do not implement CSSs consistently, developers must verify CSS styles through a tool such as the W3C CSS Validator and ensure that documents and presentation features are accessible when style sheets are turned off or not supported.

Links:

W3C 3.3: www.w3.org/TR/WCAG10-TECHS/#tech-style-sheets

CSS Validator: http://jigsaw.w3.org/css-validator/

Assessment record:

List of URIs assessed	Checkpoint met (Y or N)	Notes

W3C Checkpoint 3.4 – units

Question:

Are relative units rather than absolute units used for attribute values and style sheet property values? [ ] Yes [ ] No

Reference: W3C 3.4

Explanation:

When a document or a style sheet uses percentages and 'em' font sizes to establish measurements, users can change the units easily via their browser. Absolute measurement units must be used for the height and width of bit-mapped graphics in cases where the meaning of the graphic would be lost or diminished through rescaling.

Links:

W3C 3.4: www.w3.org/TR/WCAG10-TECHS/#tech-relative-units

Assessment record:

List of URIs assessed	Checkpoint met (Y or N)	Notes

W3C Checkpoint 3.5 – headings

Question:

Is heading markup used according to specification and only to convey document structure? [ ] Yes [ ] No

Reference: W3C 3.5

Explanation:

The proper use of headings helps separate content from structure, which is one of the core techniques of Web site accessibility. Heading elements must not be used only to create formatting effects. Heading level increments must be used correctly and in order. User-agents navigating documents through headings look for heading markup to create an outline of a page. If headings are used incorrectly, the outline will be confusing. Use CSS for general font sizing and effects.

Links:

W3C 3.5: www.w3.org/TR/WCAG10-TECHS/#tech-logical-headings

Assessment record:

List of URIs assessed	Checkpoint met (Y or N)	Notes

W3C Checkpoint 3.6 – lists

Question:

Are lists and list items properly marked up? [ ] Yes [ ] No

Reference: W3C 3.6

Explanation:

The logical structure of content requires HTML list elements "dl", "ul" and "ol" to be used only to create lists, not to format effects such as indentation. Ordered lists and contextual clues such as the use of compound numbers, eg. 1, 1.1, 1.2, 1.2.1, help decrease the possibility that users will get lost in lists. Use CSS for general formatting effects.

Links:

W3C 3.6: www.w3.org/TR/WCAG10-TECHS/#tech-list-structure

Assessment record:

List of URIs assessed	Checkpoint met (Y or N)	Notes

W3C Checkpoint 3.7 – quotations

Question:

Is quotation markup used correctly? [ ] Yes [ ] No

Reference: W3C 3.7

Explanation:

<blockquote> must not be used for formatting effects such as indentation. A screen reader, for example, interprets a <blockquote> as a verbatim quotation. This can cause the user to misinterpret the content of the text.

Links:

W3C 3.7: www.w3.org/TR/WCAG10-TECHS/#tech-quotes

Assessment record:

List of URIs assessed	Checkpoint met (Y or N)	Notes

W3C Checkpoint 4.1 – natural languages

Question:

Are changes in the natural language of a document's text and any text equivalents identified in the markup? [ ] Yes [ ] No

Reference: W3C 4.1

Explanation:

If you are using another language in the document, indicate the change through markup (eg. "lang" attribute in HTML; "xml:lang" in XML). The markup is used by Braille readers, reader browsers and translating machines to interpret and render natural language characters, pronunciation and translation. Changes in language include the 'Language Choice' button on GoC welcome pages and on the Common Menu Bar.

Links:

W3C 4.1: www.w3.org/TR/WCAG10-TECHS/#tech-identify-changes

Assessment record:

List of URIs assessed	Checkpoint met (Y or N)	Notes

W3C Checkpoint 5.1 – table headers

Question:

Are row and column headers in data tables identified? [ ] Yes [ ] No

Reference: W3C 5.1

Explanation:

The proper markup of tables, including rows, data cells and nested tables, is required to ensure that tables are read correctly by browsers and devices. Screen readers, for example, use markup to correctly interpret both the structure of the table and the relationships between headings, columns, rows and data. See the Tables section of the W3C *HTML 4.01 Specifications* document for specifications on table markup.

Links:

W3C 5.1: www.w3.org/TR/WCAG10-TECHS/#tech-table-headers

Tables: www.w3.org/TR/html4/struct/tables.html#h-11.4

Assessment record:

List of URIs assessed	Checkpoint met (Y or N)	Notes

W3C Checkpoint 5.2 – table structure

Question:

Do data tables that have two or more logical levels of row or column headers use markup to associate data cells and header cells? [ ] Yes [ ] No

Reference: W3C 5.2

Explanation:

To clarify the meaning of data in complex tables, use markup elements to associate individual data cells with their respective row and column headers. A sample of appropriate table markup is demonstrated in the W3C's Web Content Accessibility Curriculum.

Links:

W3C 5.2: www.w3.org/TR/WCAG10-TECHS/#tech-table-structure

Web Content Accessibility Curriculum: www.w3.org/WAI/wcag-curric/sam45-0.htm

Assessment record:

List of URIs assessed	Checkpoint met (Y or N)	Notes

W3C Checkpoint 5.3 – avoid tables for layout

Question:

If tables are necessary for layout, do they make sense when tables are linearized?

[ ] Yes [ ] No

Reference: W3C 5.3

Explanation:

Style sheets must be used for layout and positioning of content elements. However, when it is necessary to use a table for layout, the contents of the table must be understood when the cells become a series of paragraphs.

Links:

W3C 5.3: www.w3.org/TR/WCAG10-TECHS/#tech-avoid-table-for-layout

Assessment record:

List of URIs assessed	Checkpoint met (Y or N)	Notes

W3C Checkpoint 5.4 – avoid tables for format

Question:

If tables are necessary for layout, has the use of structural markup for the purpose of visual formatting been avoided? [ ] Yes [ ] No

Reference: W3C 5.4

Explanation:

Style sheet markup must be used for layout, positioning and formatting of text in cells. Do not use table elements that are intended to convey semantic meaning simply to emphasize text. The inappropriate use of table elements, such as <th>, may cause unexpected results in some Web devices.

Links:

W3C 5.4: www.w3.org/TR/WCAG10-TECHS/#tech-table-layout

Assessment record:

List of URIs assessed	Checkpoint met (Y or N)	Notes

W3C Checkpoint 6.1 – order style sheets

Question:

Are documents organized to make it possible to read the documents without associated style sheets? [ ] Yes [ ] No

Reference: W3C 6.1

Explanation:

Some browsers either do not support or do not implement CSSs consistently. Developers must verify CSSs through a tool such as the W3C CSS Validator and ensure that documents and presentation features are accessible when style sheets are turned off or not supported.

Links:

W3C 6.1: www.w3.org/TR/WCAG10-TECHS/#tech-order-style-sheets

CSS Validator: http://jigsaw.w3.org/css-validator/

Assessment record:

List of URIs assessed	Checkpoint met (Y or N)	Notes

W3C Checkpoint 6.2 – update dynamic content

Question:

Are equivalents for dynamic content updated when the dynamic content changes?

[ ] Yes [ ] No

Reference: W3C 6.2

Explanation:

Text descriptions of dynamically changing visual items, e.g. a timed series of images depicting a tourist attraction, must be kept up to date and synchronized with the content.

Links:

W3C 6.2: www.w3.org/TR/WCAG10-TECHS/#tech-dynamic-source

Assessment record:

List of URIs assessed	Checkpoint met (Y or N)	Notes

W3C Checkpoint 6.3 – programmatic objects

Question a):

Are pages usable when programmatic objects are turned off, not functioning or not supported? [ ] Yes [ ] No

Question b):

If pages are not usable, is equivalent information on an alternative accessible page provided? [ ] Yes [ ] No

Reference: W3C 6.3

Explanation:

Programmatic objects include scripts, applets, and other plug-ins that provide content and navigation features on the page. Redundant functionality must be provided through HTML or equivalent.

Links:

W3C 6.3: www.w3.org/TR/WCAG10-TECHS/#tech-scripts

Assessment record:

List of URIs assessed	Checkpoint met (Y or N)	Notes

W3C Checkpoint 6.4 – event handlers

Question:

Are event handlers input-device-independent for scripts and applets? [ ] Yes [ ] No

Reference: W3C 6.4

Explanation:

Not all users will have access to the device identified in an event handler. Use multiple event triggers for each event (e.g. onmouseover + onfocus, onclick + onkey press, etc). Also use the <noscript> element to ensure that all users have access to the information that would be provided if their Web device does not support event triggers.

Links:

W3C 6.4: www.w3.org/TR/WCAG10-TECHS/#tech-keyboard-operable-scripts

Assessment record:

List of URIs assessed	Checkpoint met (Y or N)	Notes

W3C Checkpoint 6.5 – accessible dynamic content

Question:

Is dynamic content accessible and, if not, is an alternative, accessible page provided?
[ ] Yes [ ] No

Reference: W3C 6.5

Explanation:

An alternative presentation for dynamic content, including frames and scripts that cause changes, is required to make Web pages accessible. In the case of frames, the source of each frame must be in HTML or another W3C-approved language. Where scripts are implemented, use the <noscript> element.

Links:

W3C 6.5: www.w3.org/TR/WCAG10-TECHS/#tech-fallback-page

Assessment record:

List of URIs assessed	Checkpoint met (Y or N)	Notes

W3C Checkpoint 7.1 – flickering

Question:

Have flickering screens been eliminated? [ ] Yes [ ] No

Reference: W3C 7.1

Explanation:

When using animated or scrolling images, remember that people with photosensitive epilepsy can have seizures triggered by flickering or flashing in the 4- to 59-flashes-per-second (Hertz) range with a peak sensitivity at 20 flashes per second.

Links:

W3C 7.1: www.w3.org/TR/WCAG10-TECHS/#tech-avoid-flicker

Assessment record:

List of URIs assessed	Checkpoint met (Y or N)	Notes

W3C Checkpoint 7.2 – blinking

Question:

Has blinking content been avoided, or if blinking must be used, is it controlled through a CSS? [ ] Yes [ ] No

Reference: W3C 7.2

Explanation:

Users must be provided with a mechanism on the page or through a CSS to stop content from blinking.

Links:

W3C 7.2 www.w3.org/TR/WCAG10-TECHS/#tech-avoid-blinking

Assessment record:

List of URIs assessed	Checkpoint met (Y or N)	Notes

W3C Checkpoint 7.3 – moving content

Question:

When a page includes moving content, is a mechanism provided within a script or applet to allow users to freeze motion or updates? [ ] Yes [ ] No

Reference: W3C 7.3

Explanation:

Screen readers are unable to read moving text. People with physical disabilities might not be able to move quickly or accurately enough to interact with moving objects. Provide a mechanism within a script or applet to allow users to freeze motion. Movement created through CSS scripting allows users to turn off or override movement more easily.

Links:

W3C 7.3: www.w3.org/TR/WCAG10-TECHS/#tech-avoid-movement

Assessment record:

List of URIs assessed	Checkpoint met (Y or N)	Notes

W3C Checkpoint 7.4 – auto-refreshing pages

Question:

Have auto-refreshing pages been eliminated? [ ] Yes [ ] No

Reference: W3C 7.4

Explanation:

The automatic refreshment of pages can be disorienting to users. Alternatives include using the server to generate HTTP-appropriate redirection codes or providing a static page that informs users that they should refresh the page often or that they should go to the URI of the updated page.

Links:

W3C 7.4: www.w3.org/TR/WCAG10-TECHS/#tech-no-periodic-refresh

Assessment record:

List of URIs assessed	Checkpoint met (Y or N)	Notes

W3C Checkpoint 7.5 – redirected pages

Question:

Is the server configured to perform redirects instead of using markup to redirect pages automatically? [ ] Yes [ ] No

Reference: W3C 7.5

Explanation:

The automatic refreshment of pages can be disorienting to users. Alternatives include using the server to generate HTTP-appropriate redirection codes or providing a static page that informs users that they should refresh the page often or that they should go to the URI of the updated page. Also see the best practices section of Standard 1.1.

Links:

W3C 7.5: www.w3.org/TR/WCAG10-TECHS/#tech-no-auto-forward

Assessment record:

List of URIs assessed	Checkpoint met (Y or N)	Notes

W3C Checkpoint 8.1 – embedded objects

Question:

Are programmatic elements such as scripts and applets directly accessible or compatible with assistive technologies? [ ] Yes [ ] No

Reference: W3C 8.1

Explanation:

When an embedded object, such as a video object control panel, has its own interface, the interface must be accessible. If the interface of the embedded object cannot be made accessible, an alternative form of the content of the object must be provided.

For further information about accessible interfaces, please consult W3C's User Agent Accessibility Guidelines and Authoring Tool Accessibility Guidelines.

Links:

W3C 8.1: www.w3.org/TR/WCAG10-TECHS/#tech-directly-accessible

User Agent Accessibility Guidelines: www.w3.org/TR/WAI-USERAGENT/

Authoring Tool Accessibility Guidelines: www.w3.org/TR/WAI-AUTOOLS/

Assessment record:

List of URIs assessed	Checkpoint met (Y or N)	Notes

W3C Checkpoint 9.1 – client-side image maps

Question:

Are client-side image maps provided instead of server-side image maps, except in instances where the regions cannot be defined with an available geometric shape?

[ ] Yes [ ] No

Reference: W3C 9.1

Explanation:

Client-side image maps can be made accessible by using 'alt' attributes for all links within the map. Server-side maps are not accessible to all users. See also: W3C 1.2.

Links:

W3C 9.1: www.w3.org/TR/WCAG10-TECHS/#tech-client-side-maps

W3C 1.2: www.w3.org/TR/WCAG10-TECHS/#tech-redundant-server-links

Assessment record:

List of URIs assessed	Checkpoint met (Y or N)	Notes

W3C Checkpoint 9.2 – element interfaces

Question:

Can an element that has its own interface be operated in a device-independent manner?

[ ] Yes [ ] No

Reference: W3C 9.2

Explanation:

Authors must not assume that all users will be using the same input device. Input devices include pointer devices, keyboards, Braille devices, head wands, microphones and others. Output devices may include monitors, printers, speech synthesizers and Braille devices. In practice, ensure that users can interact with all elements using a keyboard because most input devices provide controls that mimic keyboard inputs.

If an interface object, e.g. a multi-media player, is imported into a page, it must be accessible to a keyboard, or an accessible alternate must be provided.

Links:

W3C 9.2: www.w3.org/TR/WCAG10-TECHS/#tech-keyboard-operable

Assessment record:

List of URIs assessed	Checkpoint met (Y or N)	Notes

W3C Checkpoint 9.3 – logical event handlers

Question:

Are logical event handlers rather than device-dependent event handlers specified for scripts? [ ] Yes [ ] No

Reference: W3C 9.3

Explanation:

Ensure that features of the page can be activated in ways that do not depend on a specific device. For scripts, specify logical event handlers rather than device-dependent event handlers such as 'onmouse'. For example, in HTML use 'onfocus', 'onblur', and 'onselect'.

Links:

W3C 9.3: www.w3.org/TR/WCAG10-TECHS/#tech-device-independent-events

Assessment record:

List of URIs assessed	Checkpoint met (Y or N)	Notes

W3C Checkpoint 10.1 – pop-up and new windows

Question:

Have pop-up windows been eliminated and are users informed when a new window will open? [ ] Yes [ ] No

Reference: W3C 10.1

Explanation:

Pop-up windows are not accessible to non-visual browsers. All users are disoriented when displays or other outputs change suddenly. Users must be able control changes.

Links:

W3C 10.1: www.w3.org/TR/WCAG10-TECHS/#tech-avoid-pop-ups

Assessment record:

List of URIs assessed	Checkpoint met (Y or N)	Notes

W3C Checkpoint 10.2 – form controls

Question:

Are associated labels for form controls properly positioned to implicate the label with the control? [ ] Yes [ ] No

Reference: W3C 10.2

Explanation:

Non-visual users need to associate a control label with the control mechanism. Labels must be positioned on the same line as the control when there are two or more controls on a single line. Labels must be positioned on the line before the control when there is only one control on a line.

Links:

W3C 10.2: www.w3.org/TR/WCAG10-TECHS/#tech-unassociated-labels

Assessment record:

List of URIs assessed	Checkpoint met (Y or N)	Notes

W3C Checkpoint 11.1 – W3C technologies

Question:

Are appropriate and current versions of W3C technologies used and are they used according to specification? [ ] Yes [ ] No

Reference: W3C 11.1

Explanation:

The W3C provides extensive information about technologies recommended and under review. Use technologies to specification, even if some elements are not currently supported by browsers. They are likely to be supported in future versions.

Links:

W3C 11.1: www.w3.org/TR/WCAG10-TECHS/#tech-latest-w3c-specs

Assessment record:

List of URIs assessed	Checkpoint met (Y or N)	Notes

W3C Checkpoint 11.2 – deprecated elements

Question:

Have deprecated elements and attributes of W3C technologies been avoided?

[ ] Yes [ ] No

Reference: W3C 11.2

Explanation:

Deprecated (outdated) techniques and attributes, such as the <font> attribute, may cause accessibility problems with new browsers.

Links:

W3C 11.2: www.w3.org/TR/WCAG10-TECHS/#tech-avoid-deprecated

Assessment record:

List of URIs assessed	Checkpoint met (Y or N)	Notes

W3C Checkpoint 11.4 – accessible equivalents

Question:

If an accessible page cannot be created, is fully equivalent content provided on accessible pages? [ ] Yes [ ] No

Reference: W3C 11.4

Explanation:

If all else fails and an accessible page cannot be created, a link to an accessible page that uses W3C technologies and provides equivalent information must be provided.

Links:

W3C 11.4: www.w3.org/TR/WCAG10-TECHS/#tech-alt-pages

Assessment record:

List of URIs assessed	Checkpoint met (Y or N)	Notes

W3C Checkpoint 12.1 – frame titles

Question:

When frames are provided as an alternate format, is each frame titled in markup to facilitate frame identification and navigation? [ ] Yes [ ] No

Reference: W3C 12.1

See also: Standard 6.6

Explanation:

Under Standard 6.6, frames must only be used as an alternate format. Visual browsers organize content into visually distinct zones. Non-visual browsers must use other means to understand the connections between the content in frames. Use the "title" attribute to provide a brief description of the purpose of each frame.

Links:

W3C 12.1: www.w3.org/TR/WCAG10-TECHS/#tech-frame-titles

Standard 6.6: www.cio-dpi.gc.ca/clf-upe/6/6_e.asp - 6.6

Assessment record:

List of URIs assessed	Checkpoint met (Y or N)	Notes

W3C Checkpoint 12.2 – frame relationships

Question:

When frames are provided as an alternate format, is the purpose of frames and how frames relate to each other (if it is not obvious by frame titles alone) described?

[ ] Yes [ ] No

Reference: W3C 12.2

See also: Standard 6.6

Explanation:

Under Standard 6.6, frames must only be used as an alternate format. When a brief description using the "title" attribute is insufficient, use the "longdesc" attribute to create a meaningful description of each frame and its information function.

Links:

W3C 12.2: www.w3.org/TR/WCAG10-TECHS/#tech-frame-longdesc

Standard 6.6: www.cio-dpi.gc.ca/clf-upe/6/6_e.asp - 6.6

Assessment record:

List of URIs assessed	Checkpoint met (Y or N)	Notes

W3C Checkpoint 12.3 – information blocks

Question:

Are large blocks of information divided into manageable groups? [ ] Yes [ ] No

Reference: W3C 12.3

Explanation:

Large blocks of information, including lists and controls, must be divided into natural groupings through the use of HTML 4.01 mechanisms. Groupings can improve the navigability and comprehension of the document.

Links:

W3C 12.3: www.w3.org/TR/WCAG10-TECHS/#tech-group-information

Assessment record:

List of URIs assessed	Checkpoint met (Y or N)	Notes

W3C Checkpoint 12.4 – control labels

Question:

Are labels explicitly associated with their controls? [ ] Yes [ ] No

Reference: W3C 12.4

Explanation:

Non-visual users must be able to associate a control label with the appropriate control mechanism, so all controls must be labelled.

Links:

W3C 12.4: www.w3.org/TR/WCAG10-TECHS/#tech-associate-labels

Assessment record:

List of URIs assessed	Checkpoint met (Y or N)	Notes

W3C Checkpoint 13.1 – link targets

Question:

Is the target of each link clearly identified? [ ] Yes [ ] No

Reference: W3C 13.1

Explanation:

A link text must make sense when read out of context, either on its own or as a sequence of links. Link text must also be clear. For example, use the text "information about version 4.3" instead of "click here".

Links:

W3C 13.1: www.w3.org/TR/WCAG10-TECHS/#tech-meaningful-links

Assessment record:

List of URIs assessed	Checkpoint met (Y or N)	Notes

W3C Checkpoint 13.2 – metadata

Question:

Is metadata provided? [ ] Yes [ ] No

Reference: W3C 13.2

See also: Standard 6.3

Explanation:

Metadata provides information about Web resources. Standard 6.3 identifies the mandatory metadata tags required for all GoC Web resources.

Links:

W3C 13.2: www.w3.org/TR/WCAG10-TECHS/#tech-use-metadata

Standard 6.3: www.cio-dpi.gc.ca/clf-upe/6/6_e.asp#6.3

Assessment record:

List of URIs assessed	Checkpoint met (Y or N)	Notes

W3C Checkpoint 13.3 – site maps

Question:

Is information about the general layout of a site (e.g., a site map or table of contents) provided? [ ] Yes [ ] No

Reference: W3C 13.3

See also: Standard 6.1

Explanation:

Standard 6.1 requires all GoC Web sites to include a site map accessed through the 'Help' button on the Common Menu Bar.

Links:

W3C 13.3: www.w3.org/TR/WCAG10-TECHS/#tech-site-description

Standard 6.1: www.cio-dpi.gc.ca/clf-upe/6/6_e.asp#6.1

Assessment record:

List of URIs assessed	Checkpoint met (Y or N)	Notes

W3C Checkpoint 13.4 – navigation

Question:

Are navigation mechanisms used in a consistent manner? [ ] Yes [ ] No

Reference: W3C 13.4

See also: Standard 6.1 and Standard 6.2

Explanation:

Standards 6.1 and 6.2 promote the consistency of navigation mechanisms across GoC Web sites through the use of Common and Institutional Menu Bars.

Links:

W3C 13.4: www.w3.org/TR/WCAG10-TECHS/#tech-clear-nav-mechanism

Standard 6.1: www.cio-dpi.gc.ca/clf-upe/6/6_e.asp#6.1

Standard 6.2: www.cio-dpi.gc.ca/clf-upe/6/6_e.asp#6.2

Assessment record:

List of URIs assessed	Checkpoint met (Y or N)	Notes

W3C Checkpoint 14.1 – writing styles

Question:

Is the clearest and simplest language used for the site's content? [ ] Yes [ ] No

Reference: W3C 14.1

Explanation:

Clear and accurate language for body text, heading and links will make it easier for everyone to use the site, including people using screen readers and those with reading and cognitive disabilities. The W3C provides several tips regarding writing styles in Core Techniques for Web Accessibility Guidelines 1.0.

Links:

W3C 14.1: www.w3.org/TR/WCAG10-TECHS/#tech-simple-and-straightforward

Core Techniques for Web Accessibility Guidelines 1.0: www.w3.org/TR/WCAG10-CORE-TECHS/#writing-style

Assessment record:

List of URIs assessed	Checkpoint met (Y or N)	Notes

Standard 1.2 – document technologies

Question a):

Is HTML or another W3C-recommended language the primary format for all documents?

[ ] Yes [ ] No

Question b):

If a document cannot be represented in HTML or another recommended language, are users given information on how to obtain alternate versions? [ ] Yes [ ] No

Question c):

Are all Portable Document Format (PDF) documents identified and provided only as an alternate format? [ ] Yes [ ] No

Reference: Standard 1.2

See also: W3C 3.2

Explanations:

a) The W3C tests and recommends languages and technologies that are appropriate for widespread deployment to promote the W3C's goals of interoperability and accessibility. The use of a recommended technology alone does not ensure that a site will be accessible. The technologies must be applied according to specifications. The list of currently recommended languages can be found in the W3C document Technical Reports and Publications.

b) As a "last resort" when the use of HTML or another W3C-recommended language is not possible, users must be given directions for obtaining an alternate version of the document. Examples of alternate versions include print, large print, Braille, video or audio cassette.

c) PDF documents (minimum version 2.1) are not directly accessible to people with visual impairments or to search engines. The conversion formats provided by Adobe® may be accessible if all interoperability factors are favourable. These include the software used to create the PDF file, the complexity of the original document, and whether critical information, such as statistical data, is conveyed only through images in the document. Prior to publishing PDF documents on a Web site, read and follow the guidelines for accessibility provided by Adobe® in its Optimizing Adobe® PDF Files for Accessibility (© Adobe, 2000) white paper.

Links:

Standard 1.2: www.cio-dpi.gc.ca/clf-upe/1/1_e.asp#1.2

W3C 3.2: www.w3.org/TR/WCAG10-TECHS/#tech-identify-grammar

W3C's Technical Reports and Publications: http://www.w3.org/TR/

Optimizing Adobe® PDF Files for Accessibility: http://access.adobe.com/white-paper.html

Standard 1.2 – documents technologies

Assessment record:

List of URIs assessed	Standard met (Y or N)	Notes

Standard 1.3 – alternate formats

Question:

Is information about downloadable alternate formats available, including a description of the file type and a link to necessary viewer or reader software? [ ] Yes [ ] No

Reference: Standard 1.3

Explanation:

Users must be given clear information about alternate formats to determine whether they will be able to access the alternate format on-line or whether they must choose another method to obtain the information. The explanatory text must describe the format and provide links to sites where users can download an appropriate viewer or plug-in. If an accessible version of the plug-in is also known to be available, then a note and link to that product must also be included.

Links:

Standard 1.3: http://www.cio-dpi.gc.ca/clf-upe/1/1_e.asp#1.3

Adobe Acrobat Reader program and Adobe Acrobat files: www.tbs-sct.gc.ca/admin/instruce.html

Assessment record:

List of URIs assessed	Standard met (Y or N)	Notes

Standard 1.4 – text equivalents

Question:

Are text equivalents for all non-textual elements such as graphics, images, navigational aids and sound tracks provided? [ ] Yes [ ] No

Reference: Standard 1.4

See also: W3C 1.1, W3C 1.2 and W3C 1.4

Explanation:

Text equivalents are necessary for all users who cannot or choose not to browse graphic, video or audio information. Text equivalents are also used by search engines. Use text equivalents for images, text graphics, symbols, image maps, animations, applets, objects, ASCII art, frames, scripts, graphical bullets, spacers, graphical buttons, sounds, stand-alone audio files, audiovisual files and video clips.

Links:

Standard 1.4: www.cio-dpi.gc.ca/clf-upe/1/1_e.asp#1.4

W3C 1.1: www.w3.org/TR/WCAG10-TECHS/#tech-text-equivalent

W3C 1.2: www.w3.org/TR/WCAG10-TECHS/#tech-redundant-server-links

W3C 1.4: www.w3.org/TR/WCAG10-TECHS/#tech-synchronize-equivalents

Assessment record:

List of URIs assessed	Standard met (Y or N)	Notes

Standard 2.1 – Federal Identity Program identifiers

Question:

Is GoC participation in a collaborative arrangement acknowledged through the prominent display of one of the FIP identifiers in a way that achieves a visual balance between the government and its partners? [ ] Yes [ ] No

Reference: Standard 2.1

Explanation:

GoC institutions participating in collaborative arrangements on the Internet must ensure that the GoC's involvement is identified and visible to users through the prominent display of one of the following three Federal Identity Program (FIP) identifiers: the institutional signature, the Government of Canada signature or the "Canada" wordmark. CLF does not specify the size or placement of the FIP identifiers in a collaborative site because there are so many types of collaborative arrangements. For each collaborative site, institutions must ensure that GoC participation is acknowledged and identified in ways that respect and meet the objectives of both the Government Communications Policy and the Federal Identity Program.

GoC content and participation in all collaborative arrangements must follow all appropriate CLF standards related to accessibility, collaborative arrangements, FIP, cybersquatting, important notices and official languages.

Links:

Standard 2.1: www.cio-dpi.gc.ca/clf-upe/2/2_e.asp#2.1

Institutional signature: www.tbs-sct.gc.ca/si-si/fip-pcim/7.1/30_e.html#3

Government of Canada signature: www.tbs-sct.gc.ca/si-si/fip-pcim/7.1/signature_31/000a_e.gif

"Canada" wordmark: www.tbs-sct.gc.ca/si-si/fip-pcim/7.1/30_e.html#1

Government Communications Policy: www.tbs-sct.gc.ca/Pubs_pol/sipubs/comm/siglist_e.html

Federal Identity Program: www.tbs-sct.gc.ca/Pubs_pol/sipubs/TB_fip/siglist_e.html

Assessment record:

List of URIs assessed	Standard met (Y or N)	Notes

Standard 2.2 – symbols

Question:

Are all icons, symbols and logos shown on the Web site either federal identifier symbols approved by the Treasury Board for government-wide use, or identifiers or symbols required by partners within the context of a collaborative arrangement? [ ] Yes [ ] No

Reference: Standard 2.2

Explanation:

The use of symbols and logos is allowed in collaborative arrangements. While symbols representing other organizations, products, certifications, special events and services may be important to specific audiences, the associated icons can be perceived to constitute a GoC endorsement of a product, organization or individual. If information about a non-GoC service or organization is necessary outside the scope of a collaborative arrangement, a discrete text description of the service, organization or product must be used.

Links:

Standard 2.2: http://www.cio-dpi.gc.ca/clf-upe/2/2_e.asp#2.2

Assessment record:

List of URIs assessed	Standard met (Y or N)	Notes

Standard 3.1 – domain names

Question:

Have all institutional titles and/or acronyms, including those chosen for primary URLs, been registered as Internet domain names under .com, .net and .org? [ ] Yes [ ] No

Reference: Standard 3.1

Explanation:

To reduce the possibility that other parties will use domain names that are similar to GoC institutional titles and/or acronyms, institutions must register their institution titles and/or acronyms as Internet domain names under .com, .net and .org. This will help reduce the risk that an enterprise will register and use institutional titles and acronyms in a way that may lead some users to believe that they are accessing legitimate GoC services.

Links:

Standard 3.1: http://www.cio-dpi.gc.ca/clf-upe/3/3_e.asp#3.1

Assessment record:

List of URIs assessed	Standard met (Y or N)	Notes

Standard 4.1 – institutional addresses

Question:

Does the Web site provide users with a means of contacting the institution or individuals via electronic mail? [ ] Yes [ ] No

Reference: Standard 4.1

See also: Standard 6.1

Explanation:

An institutional e-mail address must be supplied as a link off the Common Menu Bar.

Links:

Standard 4.1: www.cio-dpi.gc.ca/clf-upe/4/4_e.asp#4.1

Standard 6.1: www.cio-dpi.gc.ca/clf-upe/6/6_e.asp#6.1

Assessment record:

List of URIs assessed	Standard met (Y or N)	Notes

Standard 4.2 – signature blocks

Question a):

Do all outgoing e-mail messages sent by GoC employees conclude with an employee signature block? [ ] Yes [ ] No

Question b):

Does contact information for e-mail addresses serving a program or a service include the institutional name, postal and e-mail addresses, telephone and fax numbers with area code? [ ] Yes [ ] No

Reference: Standard 4.2

Explanation:

The signature block must include the sender's name, institution, telephone and fax numbers with area code and extension numbers, postal address and e-mail address. See the CLF signature blocks.

Links:

Standard 4.2: www.cio-dpi.gc.ca/clf-upe/4/4_e.asp#4.2

Signature blocks: www.cio-dpi.gc.ca/clf-upe/4/4ex_e.asp

Assessment record:

List of URIs assessed	Standard met (Y or N)	Notes

Standard 4.3 – "Canada" wordmark and FIP signatures for e-mail

Question:

Does outgoing e-mail sent by GoC employees consistently and correctly use the "Canada" wordmark and the FIP institutional signature? [ ] Yes [ ] No

Reference: Standard 4.3

Explanation:

See the Federal Identity Program (FIP) Signatures for Electronic Mail.

Links:

Standard 4.3: www.cio-dpi.gc.ca/clf-upe/4/4_e.asp#4.3

Signatures for Electronic Mail: www.tbs-sct.gc.ca/si-si/fip-pcim/7.1/30_e.html#4

Assessment record:

List of URIs assessed	Standard met (Y or N)	Notes

Standard 4.4 – acknowledgements

Question:

Does the Web site have an automatic acknowledgement feature to assure users that correspondence sent to a generic, institutional or group mailbox has been received?

[ ] Yes [ ] No

Reference: Standard 4.4

Explanation:

Correspondence includes e-mails, forms, and feedback. The response can be prepared at the discretion of the institution. See the CLF Auto-Acknowledgement template.

Links:

Standard 4.4: www.cio-dpi.gc.ca/clf-upe/4/4_e.asp#4.4

Auto-Acknowledgement: www.cio-dpi.gc.ca/clf-upe/4/auto1_e.asp

Assessment record:

List of URIs assessed	Standard met (Y or N)	Notes

Standard 5.1 – important notices link

Question:

Do all Web pages include an 'Important Notices' link that directs users to an 'Important Notices' page? [ ] Yes [ ] No

Reference: Standard 5.1

Explanation:

The 'Important Notices' page provides plain language information regarding the rights, responsibilities and legal obligations of the information provider and the end user. The page must contain the 'Copyright/Permission to Reproduce' notice as per Standard 5.2 and the 'Privacy Notice' as per Standard 5.3. The language order of 'Important Notices' accessed through a bilingual Welcome Page must follow Official Language requirements as described in the best practices sections of Standard 7.3.

Links:

Standard 5.1: www.cio-dpi.gc.ca/clf-upe/5/5_e.asp#5.1

Assessment record:

List of URIs assessed	Standard met (Y or N)	Notes

Standard 5.2 – copyright notice

Question:

Is the 'Copyright/Permission to Reproduce' notice included within the text of the 'Important Notices' page? [ ] Yes [ ] No

Reference: Standard 5.2

Explanation:

This notice, based on the CLF Copyright/Permission template, explicitly acknowledges that the content has been produced by the GoC for all Canadians. The notice also provides important information regarding the ownership of the Web site's content and the conditions upon which it may be reproduced. It also helps to ensure that third-party rights will be respected.

Links:

Standard 5.2: www.cio-dpi.gc.ca/clf-upe/5/5_e.asp#5.2

Copyright/Permission: www.cio-dpi.gc.ca/clf-upe/5/5ex_e.asp

Assessment record:

List of URIs assessed	Standard met (Y or N)	Notes

Standard 5.3 – privacy notice

Question:

Is the 'Privacy Notice' text included within the text of the 'Important Notices' page?

[ ] Yes [ ] No

Reference: Standard 5.3

Explanation:

The 'Privacy Notice', based on the CLF Privacy template, advises users of the GoC's *Privacy Act* and the ways in which privacy concerns are addressed in the design and management of the Web site.

Links:

Standard 5.3: www.cio-dpi.gc.ca/clf-upe/5/5_e.asp#5.3

Privacy: www.cio-dpi.gc.ca/clf-upe/5/5ex2_e.asp

Assessment record:

List of URIs assessed	Standard met (Y or N)	Notes

Standard 5.4 – personal information

Question:

Does the Web site include a 'Privacy Notice Statement' on all pages where a user is given an opportunity to provide personal information? [ ] Yes [ ] No

Reference: Standard 5.4

Explanation:

All GoC institutions subject to the *Privacy Act* must ensure that each collection of personal information conforms to the requirements of that Act. This means that a privacy notice based on the CLF Privacy Notice for the Collection of Personal Information template must be placed directly adjacent to the request for personal information. The 'Privacy Notice Statement' must inform the individual about how the information will be used, which parts of the form are discretionary or mandatory, how long the personal information will be kept, where it will be kept, and how people can obtain access to their information.

Links:

Standard 5.4: www.cio-dpi.gc.ca/clf-upe/5/5_e.asp#5.4

Privacy Notice for the Collection of Personal Information: www.cio-dpi.gc.ca/clf-upe/5/5ex1_e.asp

Assessment record:

List of URIs assessed	Standard met (Y or N)	Notes

Standard 6.1 – common menu bar

Question:

Is the GoC Common Menu Bar used at the top of every content page in the Web site?

[ ] Yes [ ] No

Reference: Standard 6.1

Explanation:

The GoC Common Menu Bar reinforces the GoC identity while providing direct access to crucial navigation features on all GoC sites.

For bilingual sites, the Common Menu Bar must include the following five mandatory elements in this order: Language Choice; Contact Us; Help; Search; Canada Site. See the Sample Common Menu Bar.

For unilingual sites, the Common Menu Bar must include the following four mandatory elements in this order: Contact Us; Help; Search; Canada Site. See the Sample Common Menu Bar.

People using devices such as screen readers appreciate access to a 'skip navigation' link. This mechanism, hidden from visual browsers, allows users to turn off the Common Menu Bar. See the CLF site for information on the HTML coding required to provide a 'skip navigation link.'

Links:

Standard 6.1: www.cio-dpi.gc.ca/clf-upe/6/6_e.asp#6.1

Sample Common Menu Bar: www.cio-dpi.gc.ca/clf-upe/6/6common_e.asp

'Skip navigation link': www.cio-dpi.gc.ca/clf-upe/6/skip_e.asp

Assessment record:

List of URIs assessed	Standard met (Y or N)	Notes

Standard 6.2 – Institutional Menu Bar

Question a):

Do all Web pages incorporate an Institutional Menu Bar similar in design and placement to the Common Menu Bar? [ ] Yes [ ] No

Question b):

Does the terminology on the Institutional Menu Bar use plain language to describe the organization's program and services? [ ] Yes [ ] No

Reference: Standard 6.2

Explanation:

The Institutional Menu Bar must be placed directly below the Common Menu Bar. A maximum of 10 buttons can be used to provide links to institutional elements such as a 'What's New' page or to institutional sub-sites. See the CLF Institutional Menu Bar template.

Links:

Standard 6.2: www.cio-dpi.gc.ca/clf-upe/6/6_e.asp#6.2

Institutional Menu Bar: www.cio-dpi.gc.ca/clf-upe/6/6institution_e.asp

Assessment record:

List of URIs assessed	Standard met (Y or N)	Notes

Standard 6.3 – metatags

Question:

Are the following five metatags used as the metadata standard for descriptions of Web resources: Title, Originator, Language of Resource, Date and Controlled Subject?

[ ] Yes [ ] No

Reference: Standard 6.3

Explanation:

Metadata provides information about documents. Metadata is used by GoC search engines, private search engines and webCrawlers to locate Web pages, to rank them according to relevancy, and to generate searchable indices. GoC institutions must describe Internet resources using the following five mandatory metadata elements in document headers: Title, Originator, Language of Resource, Date and Controlled Subject. Metadata is used for any type of information resource or service, including HTML files and PDF or MS Word documents. Metadata can also be created for resources that are not yet on-line but are available through a contact provided on the Web page.

Links:

Standard 6.3: www.cio-dpi.gc.ca/clf-upe/6/6_e.asp#6.3

Assessment record:

List of URIs assessed	Standard met (Y or N)	Notes

Standard 6.4 – date indicator

Question:

Do all Web pages have an all-numeric currency (date) indicator located at the end of a page that conforms to the ISO date standard? [ ] Yes [ ] No

Reference: Standard 6.4

Explanation:

The date indicator must conform to one of the following formats:

Date published YYYY-MM-DD or YYYY MM DD

Date modified YYYY-MM-DD or YYYY MM DD

Last updated YYYY-MM-DD or YYYY MM DD

Links:

Standard 6.4: www.cio-dpi.gc.ca/clf-upe/6/6_e.asp#6.4

Assessment record:

List of URIs assessed	Standard met (Y or N)	Notes

Standard 6.5 – colours

Question:

Do all Web sites use only the standard 216-Web-safe colours for Web site elements?

[ ] Yes [ ] No

Reference: Standard 6.5

Explanation:

To ensure that Web pages maintain an accurate appearance across platforms, authors must use Web-safe colours for menu bars, navigation aids, typography, background, and simple graphic components. To create accessible and meaningful Web pages and elements, authors must also be aware of other colour considerations, in particular, whether colour choices provide sufficient contrast as required in W3C 2.2.

Links:

Standard 6.5: www.cio-dpi.gc.ca/clf-upe/6/6_e.asp#6.5

Assessment record:

List of URIs assessed	Standard met (Y or N)	Notes

Standard 6.6 – frames

Question:

Are frames used only as an alternate format? [ ] Yes [ ] No

Reference: Standard 6.6

Explanation:

Frames may require special attention and may present problems for effective navigation. In particular, they can prevent users from easily bookmarking specific Web content and they may cause organizational identification and CLF elements to detach from content located via search engines.

Links:

Standard 6.6: www.cio-dpi.gc.ca/clf-upe/6/6_e.asp#6.6

Assessment record:

List of URIs assessed	Standard met (Y or N)	Notes

Standard 6.7 – Web analyzer tools

Question:

Is a Web analyzer tool being used to collect site usage data? [ ] Yes [ ] No

Reference: Standard 6.7

Explanation:

Web site analyzers can report on the ways in which visitors move through a site, what keywords are used in search engine requests and which pages, files and images are most often accessed by visitors.

Links:

Standard 6.7: www.cio-dpi.gc.ca/clf-upe/6/6_e.asp#6.7

Assessment record:

List of URIs assessed	Standard met (Y or N)	Notes

Standard 6.8 – validators

Question:

Has the HTML of new and old Web pages been validated using an HTML validator?

[ ] Yes [ ] No

Reference: Standard 6.8

Explanation:

Validation tools such as the W3C HTML validation service check documents and report on errors in HTML. Similar tools can be used to check whether documents created through other W3C recommended technologies, such as CSS and XML, are well-formed and valid. Many of these tools, including ones provided by private enterprises, are linked to the recommended technologies listed on the W3C.org home page.

Links:

Standard 6.8: www.cio-dpi.gc.ca/clf-upe/6/6_e.asp#6.8

W3C HTML validation service: http://validator.w3.org/

W3C Web site: www.w3c.org

Assessment record:

List of URIs assessed	Standard met (Y or N)	Notes

Standard 7.1 – domain names

Question:

Do gc.ca registered domain names meet official languages requirements?

[ ] Yes [ ] No

Reference: Standard 7.1

Explanation:

All GoC institutions must register their gc.ca domain names using one of following two conventions:

Convention A: Use a name or acronym that, letter by letter, equally represents the institution's primary purpose in both official languages. For example: "canada.justice.gc.ca" or "ic.gc.ca".

Convention B: Connect English and French acronyms or names into single domain names, one with the English first, the other with the French first. For example, "pco-bcp.gc.ca" and "bcp-pco.gc.ca" or "businessgateway-portaildesaffaires.gc.ca" and "portaildesaffaires-businessgateway.gc.ca". The English-first domain name must appear on the Welcome Page URL line for offices outside Quebec, and the French-first domain name must appear on the Welcome Page URL line for offices inside Quebec.

Institutions may also register equivalent unilingual English and French versions of domain names if they want to use them on unilingual content pages. For example, "pco.gc.ca" for English content pages and "bcp.gc.ca" for French content pages.

You can register online and see a list maintained by PWGSC of registered gc.ca domain names at http://www.registry.gc.ca/.

Links:

Standard 7.1: www.cio-dpi.gc.ca/clf-upe/7/7_e.asp#7.1

GC.CA Subdomain Registry: http://www.registry.gc.ca/

Assessment record:

List of URIs assessed	Standard met (Y or N)	Notes

Standard 7.2 – welcome pages

Question a):

Does the Web site's Welcome Page at the main point of entry conform to FIP standards?

[ ] Yes [ ] No

Question b):

Do Welcome Pages used at a sub-site level conform to the same requirements as Welcome Pages at the main point of entry to a site? [ ] Yes [ ] No

Question c):

Are all elements of the Welcome Page viewable without scrolling in a 640 x 480 pixel screen? [ ] Yes [ ] No

Reference: Standard 7.2

Explanation:

A Welcome Page is required for all institutional sites. It is the page to which advertised URLs must point and the page to which other sites should link.

The Welcome Page must have the "Canada" wordmark in the lower right display area and the institutional signature in the upper left display area. The Welcome Page also contains space for an institutional message that sets the tone and introduces users to the Web site. The message can also identify institutional sub-sites and establish the site's visual style.

A bilingual Welcome Page must include English and French language buttons that are visually equal. The English button must be located on the left for offices located outside of Quebec. The French button must be located on the left for offices located inside Quebec. All other text used on the Welcome Page, including the "Important Notices" link described in Standard 5.1, must be in both official languages. See the CLF Bilingual Welcome Page template.

A unilingual Welcome Page must have a content button, an "Important Notices" link and a bilingual message about services provided under the Official Languages Act. (see Standard 7.4). See the CLF Unilingual Welcome Page template.

Links:

Standard 7.2: www.cio-dpi.gc.ca/clf-upe/7/7_e.asp#7.2

Bilingual Welcome Page: www.cio-dpi.gc.ca/clf-upe/6/exmpl1_e.asp

Unilingual Welcome Page: www.tbs-sct.gc.ca/si-si/fip-pcim/7.1/images/40_ue1.jpg

Assessment record:

List of URIs assessed	Standard met (Y or N)	Notes

Standard 7.3 – "Canada" wordmark and signatures

Question:

Do all Web pages contain properly placed images of the "Canada" wordmark and the institutional signature? [ ] Yes [ ] No

Reference: Standard 7.3

Explanation:

The "Canada" wordmark must appear on the lower right of all Welcome Pages and the upper right of all content pages. See the FIP Symbols of Government. The institutional signature must appear on the upper left of all Welcome and content pages. See the FIP Signatures for GoC Web Sites.

Links:

Standard 7.3: www.cio-dpi.gc.ca/clf-upe/7/7_e.asp#7.3

FIP Symbols of Government: www.tbs-sct.gc.ca/si-si/fip-pcim/7.1/30_e.html#1

FIP Signatures for GoC Web Sites: www.tbs-sct.gc.ca/si-si/fip-pcim/7.1/31_e.html

Assessment record:

List of URIs assessed	Standard met (Y or N)	Notes

Standard 7.4 – unilingual welcome page message

Question:

Do unilingual Welcome Pages include a bilingual message about where services can be obtained in the other official language? [ ] Yes [ ] No

Reference: Standard 7.4

Explanation:

The bilingual message must state that under the Official Languages Act, the office provides services to its clientele in only one official language. The message must also provide a hyperlink to a site where users have access to general information in both official languages. See the CLF Unilingual Welcome Page template.

Links:

Standard 7.4: www.cio-dpi.gc.ca/clf-upe/7/7_e.asp#7.4

Unilingual Welcome Page: www.tbs-sct.gc.ca/si-si/fip-pcim/7.1/images/40_ue1.jpg

Assessment record:

List of URIs assessed	Standard met (Y or N)	Notes

Standard 7.5 – language choice

Question:

Does the Web site allow users to proceed through it in the language of their choice?

[ ] Yes [ ] No

Reference: Standard 7.5

Explanation:

All content pages of bilingual Web sites must contain an alternate language button incorporated in the Common Menu Bar. The language button must hyperlink to the identical content in the alternate official language.

Links:

Standard 7.5: www.cio-dpi.gc.ca/clf-upe/7/7_e.asp#7.5

Assessment record:

List of URIs assessed	Standard met (Y or N)	Notes

Standard 7.6 – server messages languages

Question:

Do messages generated by the Web server comply with official language requirements?

[ ] Yes [ ] No

Reference: Standard 7.6

Explanation:

The content of all messages must appear in the language of the Web page in which they are embedded or in a bilingual format giving priority to the language of the page. Messages include instructions, permissions, confirmations and errors.

Links:

Standard 7.6: www.cio-dpi.gc.ca/clf-upe/7/7_e.asp#7.6

Assessment record:

List of URIs assessed	Standard met (Y or N)	Notes

Standard 7.7 – text equivalent languages

Question:

Are text equivalents given in the language of the Web page in which they are embedded?

[ ] Yes [ ] No

Reference: Standard 7.7

Links:

Standard 7.7: http://www.cio-dpi.gc.ca/clf-upe/7/7_e.asp#7.7

Assessment record:

List of URIs assessed	Standard met (Y or N)	Notes

Standard 7.8 – metatag languages

Question:

Do the mandatory elements that make up the metatag for a Web page as per Standard 6.3 correspond to the page's official language? [ ] Yes [ ] No

Reference: Standard 7.8

Links:

Standard 7.8: http://www.cio-dpi.gc.ca/clf-upe/7f7_e.asp#7.8

Assessment record:

List of URIs assessed	Standard met (Y or N)	Notes

Standards 7.9 – collaborative arrangements languages

Question:

Do Web sites representing a collaborative arrangement comply with official languages requirements? [ ] Yes [ ] No

Reference: Standard 7.9

Explanation:

Federal institutions must ensure that their content posted on collaborative Web sites complies with the official languages requirements that would apply if the site were strictly the site of the office in question.

Links:

Standard 7.9: http://www.cio-dpi.gc.ca/clf-upe/7/7_e.asp#7.9

Assessment record:

List of URIs assessed	Standard met (Y or N)	Notes

Standard 7.10 – e-mail addresses

Question:

Do e-mail addresses for all employees correspond to the institution's chosen bilingual domain name? [ ] Yes [ ] No

Reference: Standard 7.10

Explanation:

E-mail addresses must conform to the institution's chosen domain name (see Standard 7.1). An institution using a connected French-English set of names or acronyms for a domain name must use the same convention for an employee e-mail address, e.g. doe.john@hc-sc.gc.ca.

Links:

Standard 7.10: www.cio-dpi.gc.ca/clf-upe/7/7_e.asp#7.10

Assessment record:

List of URIs assessed	Standard met (Y or N)	Notes